This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Educ
2248
21.10

Modern Language Association of America
Publications
Vol. XXXIII, 1918
Number 1

The Romance Sources of the Saga af Tristram ok Ísodd

By
Frederick Paul Magoun, Jr.

Educ 2248.91.10

Harvard College
Library

FROM THE LIBRARY OF

Horatio Stevens White

Class of 1873

PROFESSOR OF GERMAN, EMERITUS

Received June 12, 1935

MODERN LANGUAGES

AND CLASSICS

IN

AMERICA AND EUROPE

SINCE 1880

TEN YEARS' PROGRESS OF THE NEW LEARNING.

BY

A. F. CHAMBERLAIN, M.A.

(Clark University, Worcester, Mass.)

TORONTO, CANADA:
PRESS OF THE WEEK, 5 JORDAN STREET.
1891.

H. D. White

Ithaca.

N. Y.

May 11/92.

MODERN LANGUAGES

AND CLASSICS

IN

AMERICA AND EUROPE

SINCE 1880

TEN YEARS' PROGRESS OF THE NEW LEARNING.

BY

A. F. CHAMBERLAIN, M.A.

(Clark University, Worcester, Mass.)

TORONTO, CANADA:
PRESS OF THE WEEK, 5 JORDAN STREET.
1891.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM THE LIBRARY OF
PROFESSOR HORATIO STEVENS WHITE
JUNE 12, 1935

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

UNITED STATES.—Opinions of Profs. Brandt, Cook, McAllister, Lowell, Eliot, Moulton, Emerson, McCook, Van Daell, McKay, Lovell, Clement, Leotsakos, Schurman, on the position of Greek in Education. Opinions of Brinton, Hale, etc., on the excellences of the Greek languages. Comparison of Greek with savage tongues 5

GREAT BRITAIN.—Opinions of Dr. Wagner, Prof. Sayce, Prof. Max Müller, Prof. Earle, Dr. Welldon, Prof. Alex. Bain, Prof. Sidgwick, Prof. A. J. Ellis, Prof. Eve, Oscar Browning, Prof. Huxley. Classics and English style. Opinions of Prof. Earle, Prof. Bain, Dasent, Landor, Browning, etc.... 14

FRANCE.—Opinions of MM. Berthelot, Rabier, Weill, Bréal, Fouillée, Ferneuil, Combes, Simon, Bourgeois, Dreyfus-Brisac 25

ITALY.—Opinions of Sign. Cremona, M. Lafaye, Prof. Lombroso. 31

HUNGARY.—History of the Greek campaign. Opinions of Prof. Kemény, Count Czáky (Minister of Education), Deputies Kovács, Madarász, Zay, Asbóth, Schvarcz, Prof. Pulszky, Prof. Jonas, Deputies Ordódy, Ugrón, Helfy. Opinions of Hungarian newspapers. Decision of the Government..... 33

GERMANY.—The Hofmann manifesto and since then. Opinions of Prof. James, Prof. Fernall, Drs. Wislicenus, Specht, Paulsen, Schlee, Schmeding, Laveleye, Prince Bismarck, Prof. Preyer, Drs. Cauer, Zeller, Burnham, Göring, Emperor William. The educational commission. Opinions of German newspapers 39

NORWAY AND SWEDEN.—Opinions of Chancellor De Geer, of members of the Storting, of Jacob Sverdrup (Minister of Education). Action of the Government 58

We cannot overstate our debt to the past, but the moment has the supreme claim. The past is for us; but the sole terms on which it can become ours are its subordination to the present.—*Emerson.*

No hay pájaros en los nidos de antano.
—*Spanish Proverb.*

Therefore think not the past is wise alone,
For yesterday knows nothing of the Best,
And thou shalt love it only as the nest
Whence glory-winged things to Heaven have flown.
—*Lowell.*

Im neuen Staat eine neue Schule.
—*Dr. Chr. Volksmann.*

Was zur Zeit des Endes des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts notwendig war, bleibt es nicht für alle Zeiten.—*Dr. Paulsen.*

And though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek,
From thence to honour thee, I will not seek
For names: but call forth thundering Æschylus,
Euripides and Sophocles to us.
Pacuvius, Accius, him of Cordoua dead,
To live again, to hear thy buskin tread,
And shake a stage; or when thy socks were on,
Leave thee alone for the comparison
Of all, that insolent Greece, or haughty Rome
Sent forth, or since did from their ashes come.
Triumph my Britain, thou hast one to show,
To whom all scenes of Europe homage owe.
—*Ben Jonson.*

MODERN LANGUAGES AND CLASSICS SINCE 1880.

THE UNITED STATES.[1]

IN the United States much progress has been made since Prof. Adams' vigorous assault on the "College Fetish," which so excited the worshippers of the dead past a few years ago. As Prof. H. G. Brandt pointedly remarks:—

"We are recovering from the shock that the bestowal of A.B. without Greek gave us. Our classical friends may as well recognize that there is going on, both in Germany and in this country, a rearrangement of the relations between gymnasium, realschule and university, and between preparatory school, college and university, and that in this rearrangement French and German have gained a firm foothold, not only as alternatives, but even as substitutes."[2]

The unheard of catastrophies and woful calamities prophesied so confidently by the "Græco-philes" have not yet occurred, and the world still pursues the even tenor of its way, in spite of the mortal insult offered to the immortal Hellenes.

---

[1] The writer begs to return to Dr. W. H. Burnham, of Clark University, Worcester, Mass., his thanks for his kindness in placing at his disposal many of the works discussed in this essay and for other courtesies.

[2] "Should the Elements of French and German be Required for Admission to all Colleges?" Regents' Report, 1889, Univ. State of New York, pp. 51-61. See espec., pp. 57, 58.

Prof. Macallister, Superintendent of Schools, of Philadelphia, does not hesitate to express his preference for the modern over the ancient languages.[1]

Prof. J. P. Cook, of Harvard,[2] would, in his scientific course, have no Greek at all, and "for the present a limited amount of Latin." This is even worse than the Kaiser Wilhelm's "*ein bischen Griechisch dazu.*"

A few years ago the classicists thought they had a tower of strength in James Russell Lowell, a litterateur of classic training and education. But there were many who believed that he could not be a bigoted opponent of modern languages who wrote lines like these:—

> Therefore think not the past is wise alone,
> For yesterday knows nothing of the Best,
> And thou shalt love it only as the nest
> Whence glory-wingèd things to Heaven have flown.

and these:—

> New occasions teach new duties;
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> They must upward still, and onward, who
> Would keep abreast of Truth.

And time has justified their belief.

At the Seventh Annual Convention of the Modern Language Association of America, held at Cambridge, Massachusetts, in December, 1889,[3] after President Eliot had welcomed the visitors to the historical University of that city, Dr. Lowell delivered an address that was both able and eloquent, as indeed all the speeches of the distinguished orator and poet have been. It was well that in the halls of Harvard the speaker who had been trained in the lore of the classics should so well place the case of the Modern Languages before his audience and before the public. A few extracts from his speech will serve to indicate what his opinion is at present:—

---

[1] See Op. Cit., pp. 63-68.

[2] *Pop. Science Monthly*, Vol. xxiv. (1884), pp. 1-6. See also the article of Prof. James in Vol. xxiv., 289-306.

[3] See Publication of the Mod. Lang. Asso. of Amer., Vol. v., No. 1, Jan.-Mar., 1890, pp. 1-22.

"For every man is, more or less consciously, the prisoner of his date, and I must confess I was a great while emancipating myself from the formula which prescribed the Greek and Latin classics as the canonical books of that infallible Church of culture outside of which there could be no salvation, none, at least, that was orthodox. Indeed, I am not sure that I have wholly emancipated myself even yet. The old phrases (for mere phrases they had mostly come to be) still sing in my ears with a pleasing, if not a prevailing, enchantment."

"I am not ashamed to confess that the first stammerings of our English speech have a pathetic charm for me which I miss in the wiser utterances of a tongue, not only foreign to me as modern languages are foreign, but thickened in its more delicate articulations by the palsying touch of time. And from the native woodnotes of many modern lands, from what it was once the fashion to call the rude beginnings of their literature, my fancy carries away, I find, something as precious as Greek or Latin could have made it."

"And it is getting to be understood that as a training of the faculties, the comparative philology, at least, of the modern languages may be made as serviceable as that of the ancient. The classical superstitions of the English race made them especially behindhand in this direction, and it was long our shame that we must go to the Germans to be taught the rudiments of our mother-tongue. This is no longer true."

Lowell, however, strikes the key-note when he says: "The day will come, nay, it is dawning already, when it will be understood that the masterpieces of whatever languages are not to be classed by an arbitrary standard, but stand on the same level in virtue of their being masterpieces; that thought, imagination and fancy may make even a *patois* acceptable to scholars; that the poets of all climes and of all ages 'sing to one clear harp in divers tones,' and that the masters of prose and the masters of verse in all tongues teach the same lesson and exact the same fee."

Here we have the *suum cuique* of the German Professor, which the Kaiser Wilhelm endorsed so heartily.

In his address of welcome President Eliot thus referred to the great change that had taken place in Harvard:—

"But it was only in 1887 that we took a step which I trust may yet be taken by many American institutions, namely, the puting of advanced examinations in French and German upon a par with advanced examinations in Latin, Greek, Mathematics and all other subjects at the admission examination. We require, for admission to Harvard College, besides a knowledge of certain elementary subjects, the passing of examinations in at least two advanced subjects. Now the advanced subjects used to be with us, as in most other American institutions, only Latin, Greek and Mathematics; but, in 1887, we put French and German on a perfect equality with the ancient subjects; and now any candidate for admission may present as advanced subjects French and German, if he chooses, as well as Latin and Greek, or Latin and Mathematics, or Mathematics and Science; and I submit to you that this is a considerable step towards the introduction of advanced teaching of these languages into the secondary schools."

In the *Atlantic Monthly* for June, 1891, there is an interesting article by Prof. Richard G. Moulton on "Classical Literature in Translation." Prof. Moulton (a Cambridge man), who is well known in connection with the University Extension Movement, argues that the use of "translated classics" is an imperative necessity. A few extracts from his article may be given here:—

"I start from a patent fact—the widespread ignorance of classical literature on the part of persons who have received a classical education." (p. 773.)

"In fact the study called 'classics' appears at the present moment to be the greatest of all the obstacles in the way of any real study of the ancient classics." (p. 773.)

"The ancient classics must be studied in the vernacular." (p. 704.)

"One of the gravest charges against the existing study of classics is its looseness and want of thoroughness. It

is worse than inaccurate; it corrupts the sense of accuracy by violating the proportions of things and requiring exactness in details while it leaves vague and flimsy ideas, or a total absence of ideas about things that are great." (p. 775.)

Mr. Moulton appeals to his own experience and to that of men who have been trained in the classics to enforce his arguments, that the great writers of the past should be studied in the vernacular: "The class might know less Greek, but they would know Homer and never lose their love for him." (p. 777.)

His views seem to coincide with those of Emerson, who says:—

"I should just as soon think of swimming across the Hudson in a coat of mail when I can take a penny steamer, as of studying the classics in the original when I can read them in the admirable translations of Mr. Bohn." [1]

Regarding the amount of time devoted to Greek in the various Universities and Colleges in the United States, some interesting facts are to be found in the paper of Dr. Chas. Mcintire[2] in the *University Magazine* for March, 1891. He gives the percentage of time given to the course of A.B. in 40 American Colleges, ranging from 0 (Tulane University) to 23.5% (Oskaloosa College). In 35 of the Institutions enumerated the percentage is less than 20; in these are included Bowdoin College with 5.7%, Cornell University with 9.82%, Williams College with 10.4%, Brown University with 11.3%, University of California with 11.3%. In these same colleges "the percentage of *required* Latin" varies from 0 to 29.

At the meeting of the "New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools," held at Boston in October, 1890, Prof. J. J. McCook of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., expressed the opinion of very many American educators when he said:—

"Public opinion does seem to be asking for more French and German, because their utility is more obvious than that of Latin and Greek, or even the higher Mathe-

[1] Cited in "Sonnenschein's Cyclopædia of Education" (1889), p. 59.

[2] The Value of the A.B. Degree. Pp. 255-9.

matics. And having been interested since last commencement in getting two college gradutes 'started in life,' I have come to have a more feeling sense than ever before of the importance of the argument from utility. The *Brotstudien* are commanding more and more my sympathies."[1]

At the same meeting Dr. Alphonse N. van Daell, who spoke of the value of the modern languages in education, said:—

"For my part I love Homer and would not part for any consideration with my enjoyment of Greek literature, but there is also a civilizing influence in Molière and Goethe, and in the life of modern nations. It seems to me that it is narrow prejudice to deny a proposition so evident; and how many can appreciate modern ideas, when they would fail utterly to grasp the value of ancient ideas which have only a more remote connection with our own."[2]

At the Fifth Holiday Conference of the Associated Academic Principals of the State of New York, at Syracuse, Dec. 26-27, 1889, some interesting discussions took place.[3]

Principal McKay, of the Franklin Academy at Malone, says (p. 3): "I find my classes in physics and chemistry growing at the expense of my classes in Greek."

Principal Lovell, of Elmira: "When Johns Hopkins University and Harvard University,—two of the leading four universities of this continent,—will give the A.B. without Greek, it is too late in the century for us to insist upon Greek as one of the pre-requisites to entrance to college." (p. 20.) With these remarks Principal Farr, of Glenns Falls, coincided. (p. 19.)

The upshot of the discussion was, that a motion was passed recommending the Regents of the University to issue a new "modern diploma," in which Greek and Latin should be replaced by French and German.

A motion recommending the substitution of "a modern

---

[1] The *Academy* (Boston), Vol. v., No. 8 (Nov., 1890), p. 449.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 455.

[3] See *Academy*, February, 1890, pp. 1-79.

language" for Greek in the "classical" diploma was also carried.

A valuable contribution to the Greek question is the paper of Prof. E. W. Clement, English Teacher in the High School, Mito, Japan, on "Greek in Secondary Schools," which appeared in *Education* (Boston) for March, 1890. (pp. 425-428.) Prof. Clement, who writes "as one who has himself studied Greek, not because he was compelled, but because he liked to study it; as one who had the advantage inestimable of the personal instruction of Dr. James R. Boise, the Nestor of the Greek scholars and teachers of the United States," and, as one who has himself taught Greek, comes to the conclusion "that the Greek language ought to have no place in the course of study of secondary education, of high schools, and academies,—but ought to be relegated to the curriculum of higher education,—of colleges and universities." (p. 425.)

"Thus one 'course' would be economized by dropping Greek; and only one dead language, the Latin, which is surely more important than Greek to the average student, would be taught in secondary schools." (p. 427.) This, Prof. Clement claims, would cause Greek to be "studied to much greater profit in the college and the university." (p. 427.)

There has been growing in the United States a feeling in favour of making Greek a modern language by teaching not in the un-Greek fashion of the graduate of Cambridge or Oxford, but as if the tongue had some life in it. Prof. J. P. Leotsakos, of the University of Athens (Greece), says:—

"The aim in learning Greek should be to read Greek in Greek, and not in some other tongue. Mere translation is the means to an end, not the end itself; and its function ceases the moment it brings us into contact with the Greek mind; then we become Greeks—in mind. Greek should be taught as a living language; for there is nothing dead about it, though the antiquated methods of teaching it have done much to make it appear so."[1]

[1] Programme of the Sauveur Summer School of Languages at the University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, 1891, p. 9.

And to this very sensible conclusion the Philhellenes must sooner or later come. The ultra-classicists will hold up their hands in holy horror at the sacrilege of Prof. J. G. Schurman of Cornell University, who does not hesitate to declare that "the steam-engine is as sacred as Greek."

Shades of Homer and Demosthenes, was ever the like averred before? The new learning is growing apace in America, and the old-fashioned educational theories that have so long held sway are being replaced by others more in consonance with the progress and advancement that have always distinguished the present from the past.

A good deal of nonsense and rhetorical braggadocio have been uttered by the ultra-classicists who believe in the superiority of the Greek language over all tongues of earth, past or present. This sort of talk is often indulged in by people who ought to know better than to put forward such absurd claims; but we find even a professor of Comparative Philology giving utterance to similar ideas in this last decade of the nineteenth century. A few citations from American scholars on this point may prove of interest.

Speaking of the Algonkin tongue Prof. W. D. Whitney[1] remarks:—

"There are infinite possibilities of expression in such a structure; and it would only need that some native-American Greek race should arise, to fill it full of thought and fancy, and to put it to the uses of a noble literature, and it would be rightly admired as rich and flexible, perhaps, beyond anything else that the world knew."

Dr. D. G. Brinton, the foremost of Americanists, says:—

"The Greek is a beautiful language; so is the Chipeway; but any one who maintains that either, or that any language on the model of either, is superior as a medium of intellectual intercourse to the modern English, flies in the face of all that linguistic evolution teaches, and all that the history of mental development itself inculcates."[2]

He also remarks:—

"Let me turn aside for a moment to warn you against

---

[1] Cited by Horatio Hale in *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, Jan., 1888, p. 342.

[2] "Aims and Traits of a World-Language," New York, 1889, p. 16.

those antiquated teachers who point to the marvellous symmetry of Latin, Greek and Sanscrit, as representing the highest type of linguistic structure. Their arguments are effete and delusive. They might as well point as a model of government to one of the German cities in the Middle Ages, where laws regulated everything, down to how many petticoats a burgher's wife should wear, and how many dishes she should have for dinner. Such niceties, such complexities, such regularities, are hindrances and limitations, not aids, to thought. You find them in their rankest development in the tongues of nations of the lowest culture." (p. 16.)

Prof. Horatio Hale, the Nestor of Ethnologists, quite coincides with Dr. Brinton, when he says :—

"The senseless superfluity of declensions and conjugations, the needless variety in the methods of forming the plural, the inordinate perplexity of the irregular verbs, are only a few of the evidences to be noted of the striking deficiency in logical and classifying power which, amid all their unquestioned excellences, the earlier Aryan languages everywhere betray." [1]

Of the Mpongwe language of West Africa, Prof. Hale remarks :—[2]

"Dr. R. N. Cust, in his work on the 'Modern Languages of Africa,' has given us the opinions expressed by the able French and English and American missionaries and grammarians who have written on the remarkable Mpongwe language, spoken on the western coast of that continent, near the equator. They speak, with one accord, of its 'beauty and capability,' its 'elaborate structure and musical tone,' its 'regularity, exactness and precision,' its 'order and philosophical arrangement,' and especially its 'wonderful capacity for conveying new ideas,' making it needless for the missionaries to borrow foreign words in their biblical translations."

Absit omen! Why, these are the same familiar terms that we have so often heard applied to the divine speech of Hellas.

---

[1] *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, March, 1889, p. 679.

[2] *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, January, 1888, p. 342.

If the classicists want an inflected language to use as a means of mental culture, why don't they turn their attention (especially the comparative philologists) to the Nahuatl of Old Mexico, whose verb has "865 regularly derived forms," or the Santal of Indian, "where every verb has no fewer than 3000?" To train their intellectual giants, who learn French and German in "less than one-thousandth of the time they devote to Greek," they might take up the study of Otchipwé, a language in which "every verb is capable of eighteen million variations, all regular and legitimate derivatives." [1]

GREAT BRITAIN.

The value of Greek as a pedagogical subject, and the flexibility and adaptability of that language as a means of conveying human thoughts with their ever-varying development, have been extolled through the ages by scholars and by teachers, and not a little of the strong hold Greek has had upon the scholastic world has been due to the persistence with which its claims to pre-eminence have ever been asserted. By mere dint of repetition many have come to believe in it. It has been fostered by all those private and public influences that the accumulated conservatism of centuries has been able to bring to bear upon our educational institutions. The "classics" have "vested interests." Let us hear what Prof. Gildersleeve of Johns Hopkins University, one of the foremost classical scholars of America, says on this point: "The vested interests of classical study are even from a mercantile point of view enormous. Not only teachers but book-makers have a heavy stake in the

[1] Brinton, "Aims and Traits of a World-Language," p. 16.

fortunes of the classics, and the capital involved in them reminds us of the pecuniary hold of paganism in the early Christian centuries."[1]

It has taken England a long time to perceive that there was truth in the remark of Dr. Whewell, that "mere classical reading is a narrow and enfeebling education," and to seize the point in Sydney Smith's apt phrase "the safe and elegant imbecilities of classical culture."[2]

But there have been signs by the way and the finale is not far off.

In 1873, Dr. Wagner, in the Annual Address of the President of the Philological Society of London, said:—

"We have passed the stage of a sentimental admiration of the ancient authors, such as we find it in the editions of Heyne and his school. Our eyes are fully open to the shortcomings and failings of Latin literature when considered esthetically, nor do we any longer attribute to this literature the 'humanizing' influence so naïvely believed in by former centuries. . . . But the days in which it was held the height of Latin scholarship to write a splendid Ciceronian style, and to turn neat Latin verses are past, and will never return."[3]

Prof. Sayce remarks:—[4]

"Apart from Comparative Philology, however, there can be no scientific study of articulate language; and if philology means something other than this, it would be absurd to rank the scientific under the unscientific. But this is what is popularly done—philology, signifying sometimes a dilettante acquaintance with the canons of taste and polite literature, and in fact everything that is not the science of language; sometimes classical scholarship, in which the correction of a MS., or the close imitation of an Augustan writer, is the result aimed at. Now these are all very good things, in their way; but it cannot be

[1] Cited in *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, Vol. XXIV. (1884), p. 257.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 265-8.

[3] Cited in Sayce: "Princ. of Comp. Phil.," 3rd Ed., 1885, pp. 11-12.

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 58-59.

too often repeated that they have nothing in common with Comparative Philology. Classical scholarship may, indeed, contribute much valuable material to the science, so far at least as Latin and Greek are concerned; but even here its supposed discoveries often turn out to be erroneous when investigated by the light of the comparative method, and can seldom be received without further examination, unless the facts are very plain and self-evident."

By those classicists and comparative philologists of the old school, who still linger amongst us, the confession of Prof. Max Müller, the foremost of English comparative philologists, will be read with interest. As one who has "been through the mill," he says:—[1]

"I myself was brought up in the straitest school of classical scholarship. I was led to believe that there were only two so-called classical languages in the world—Greek and Latin; and that all the other nations of Europe were more or less of barbarians till they were debarbarized by contact with Greek and Roman civilization. That the language of the ancient Germans or Celts could have been anything but an uncouth jargon as compared with the language of Homer and Virgil; that the grammar of the Goths could have been as perfect as that of the Hellenes; that the natives of Gaul and Germany could have possessed a religion, a mythology, and an epic poetry that could be compared to the religion, the mythology, and the epic poetry of Greeks and Romans,—these are ideas which would have been scouted by all scholars, in fact by all educated people, at the beginning of our century. But facts will have their way, however they may be scouted at first. That the Gothic language was as finely organized as Latin, admitted of no contradiction. That the religion and the mythology of the Teutonic nations flowed from the same source as the religion and the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, had to be granted even by the best Greek and Latin scholars of the day, such as Gottfried

[1] "Three Lectures on the Science of Language," London, 1890, pp. 38-39.

Hermann, Otfried Müller, and Welcker. And that the epic poetry of Iceland and of Germany, the Edda and the Nibelunge, contained fragments of as peculiar beauty as the Homeric poems, was freely acknowledged by the foremost poets and critics in Germany, such as Herder and Goethe."

Some shut their eyes to the change that is taking place; they will not see it.

Prof. John Earle, of Oxford, who is well known in the field of philology, makes some pertinent remarks on the comparative merits of the ancient and the modern languages:—[1]

"Modern languages have a continuity of development and a flexibility of action, and growing out of these a power of following the movements of the mind, such as was never attained by the classical languages. If we take Demosthenes and Cicero as the maturest products of the Greek and Latin languages, we feel that they do not attain to the range of the best modern European writers. Great elasticity, great plasticity, has been added to the language by the development of symbolism; great acquisitions have been made both in the compass and in the rhythm of language. This, of course, displays itself chiefly in the higher oratorical efforts."

Greek has been the bulwark of the classicists in England, and most of the fighting has been carried on about it. It is scarcely necessary to refer to the spirited protest of Herbert Spencer, which other scientists have since repeated; it is apparent that Greek is slowly but surely losing ground in England. Only a few short months ago the Philhellenes won a Pyrrhic victory, but as some of their friends remarked, "Another victory like this and we are undone." This was on the occasion of the Conference of Head-Masters of the English Public Schools on the 23rd of December, 1890, when the following resolution, moved by Dr. J. E. C. Welldon, Head-Master of Harrow, was lost but by a vote of 31 to 29:—

[1] "Philology of the English Tongue," Fourth Edition, Oxford, 1887, p. 636.

"That, in the opinion of this Conference, it would be a gain to education if Greek were not a compulsory subject in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge." Since then the classicists have been endeavouring to explain away their moral defeat, but in vain.

In the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1891, there is one long wail of grief at the utter perverseness of these latter days, when that terror of the classicists, the formidable *Zeitgeist*, makes his presence so felt in the land. The comments of the Philhellene *Spectator* (Dec. 27) on the vote show that the people of England are getting heartily tired of the preposterous demands and "exaggerated" claims of the myopic graduates of the classic nurseries. The opinion of America is voiced by the *Educational Review* for March, 1891, which says:—

"The case for compulsory Greek rests upon sentiment, not upon demonstration." (p. 282.)

"The really able, progressive thinkers in the Conference were in favour of Mr. Welldon's motion." (p. 282.)

"The opposition consisted in prophecies of woe and disaster, if Greek was no longer required, and assumed, without proof, as is usual in these arguments, that a smattering of Greek in some mysterious way gives a culture and discipline not otherwise attainable." (p. 282.)

The editor cites approvingly the remark of the London (England) *Journal of Education*, that "such another victory for Greek would be fatal to its cause."

Other straws show the way the wind is beginning to blow in the British Isles. It is very probable that the parliamentary commission of Lord Kinnear will have as a result the making of Greek less prominent in educational curricula.[1]

In the *Academy* (London), May 23, 1891, the statement appears that of the total expenditure of the University of Cambridge, amounting to £31,500, only £1,600 went to classics; £21,500 going to physical science and £800 to history; and of the £17,000 expended in building, £13,000 went to the sciences. (p. 489.)

[1] Pedag. Sem. Jan., 1891, p. 108.

It need cause no surprise, then, to find the *Journal of Education* (London) in its issue of May 1, 1891, expressing the opinion that "to pronounce a liberal education without Greek inconceivable is—there is no other word for it—absurd." (p. 238.) And a writer in the same periodical sarcastically calls up the well-known joke that Englishmen may understand each other when they speak Greek, but no one else does.

The London *Academy* for June 13, 1891, contains an account of a very interesting discussion of the place of "classics" in the English educational system.

On Saturday, May 30, 1891, a meeting of the Cambridge University Senate was held to discuss the following "Grace":—

"That a syndicate be appointed to consider whether it be expedient to allow alternatives, and if so, what alternatives, for Greek in the previous examination, either to all students or to any classes of students other than those already exempted."

According to the *Academy*, the Council have now amended the "Grace" by substitution for "Greek" the words "one of the two classical languages." The amended "Grace" will be offered to the Senate at an early congregation in Michaelmas term; and at the same time it will be proposed to nominate a syndicate with instructions to report to the Senate before the end of Lent term 1892.

From the brief outline of the discussion in the Senate given in the *Academy* the debate seems to have been quite animated. Among those who spoke in favour of the proposed change were Prof. Henry Sidgwick, Sir George Humphry (who was in favour of increasing the amount of Latin required, and omitting Greek), Dr. Montagu Butler, the Vice-Chancellor, and Dr. Peile, the Master of Christ's, who has recently been elected Vice-Chancellor in succession to Dr. Montagu Butler. The speakers referred to the vote that took place on Dr. Welldon's motion some few months ago, and expressed their opinion that some reform must be made in a very short time, that the great bulk of the English people would soon demand it in no uncertain

terms, and the best thing that the ultra-classicists could do was to submit to the inevitable.

In the sister University of Oxford, it is proposed to institute a new Final Honour School in English Language and Literature. (*Academy*, May 16, 1891.)

A very interesting contribution to the classics question is to be found in the tenth chapter (pp. 359-389) of Prof. Alexander Bain's "Education as a Science" (N.Y., 1888), where the arguments on both sides are stated and discussed. This chapter on "The Value of the Classics" should be read by every student of languages. There Prof. Bain shows the weaknesses of the arguments of the classicists and predicts that the time when Greek must be made optional is not far off. His own opinion he expresses as follows:—

"The learning of a language has a value according to the use that we are to make of it. This is admitted. If we are to listen to French, speak French, read and write French, we must be taught the language. So, Latin being the literary medium of the Middle Ages had to be known by every scholar. But if we are not to use a language at all, or very little, as is the case with the majority of those that learn Latin and Greek at school and college, is there any other reason for undergoing the labour? This is the question of the day as to the utility of the Dead Languages. At a later stage I intimate my view as regards the learning of Languages, that their main, if not their sole, justification is that we mean to use them as languages, to receive and to impart knowledge by their means. This does not exclude the pleasure we may take in the poetical compositions of a foreign tongue." (pp. 167-168.)

Regarding Rhetoric, Prof. Bain says: "Yet there is no reason for connecting it with an unused language; we can always find excercises in the languages that we are to speak or to write." (p. 168.)

As to the effects of classical study upon style, he says: "All experience shows that only very inferior English composition is the result of translating from Latin or Greek into English. There is necessarily a good deal of straining to make the English fit the original; while the

greater number of the most useful forms of the language are never brought into requisition at all." (p. 383.)

Regarding the linguistic value of the classic languages, Prof. Bain cites with approval the opinion of Prof. Sayce (See *Nature*, November 23, 1876): "For purely philological purposes they are of less interest than many a savage jargon, the name of which is almost unknown, and certainly than those spoken languages of modern Europe whose life and growth can be watched like that of the living organism, and whose phrenology can be studied at first hand." (p. 379.)

Mr. Henry Sidgwick, in his "Essays on a Liberal Education," comes to the following conclusion:—

"I think that a course of instruction in our own language and literature, and a course of instruction in natural science, ought to form recognized and substantive parts of our school system.

"I think, also, that more stress ought to be laid on the study of French."

To make room, Prof. Sidgwick proposes to "exclude Greek from the curriculum, at least in its earlier stage."[1]

The late Prof. A. J. Ellis,[2] who is well known as an authority in philology, boldly expresses his opinion that the devotion to the "classical" languages must now end.

"Every speaker is bound to know his own language first, without relation to other languages."

"Lessons in language should be supplemented with lessons on things. We must have something to speak and write about besides language itself."

"Hitherto, German and French have been regarded as the accomplishments, and Latin and Greek as the staple, of literary education. It is time to reverse the terms. Latin and Greek have drifted into being accomplishments."

It may be remarked that Prof. E. A. Freeman, the historian, in an article in the March (1891) number of *Macmillan's Magazine* has rushed to the defence of compulsory Greek, but he advances no new arguments, and

[1] Cited in Bain, Educ. as Science, p. 387.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 388.

fails to see the force of certain objections to his opinions.

On the other hand, we have the opinion of Prof. Seeley, expressed some time ago when addressing the Seventh Congress of French Professors resident in England:—

"I submit that the position of the classicists is untenable, and that their *non possumus* must be unreasonable as to substituting in education Modern Languages for the ancient." (102nd Rep. of Regents of Univ. State of N. Y., 1889, p. 64.)

The Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, the Master of Harrow, in an address before the eighth congress of the "Société Nationale des Professeurs de français en Angleterre," held at Harrow on April 21, 1890, said that "at Harrow the modern side was of always increasing importance, and in its curriculum nothing had a higher place than the teaching of modern languages."[1]

The movement against too much attention to the classics has, in England, taken a new turn in the demand for the supplanting of Latin by German. In *Education* (London) for May, 1891, Mr. H. W. Eve has an excellent paper on "German *vs.* Latin." He takes up the question from a pedagogical, a linguistic, a grammatical and a literary point of view, and concludes that German is to be preferred in every way. In an editorial note *Education* says, "the great mass of the general public will be found ranged on the side of Mr. Eve," and asks the pointed question, "if, on utilitarian grounds, Latin is put before Greek, how much more should we prefer German to Latin?"

A further discussion of the German-Latin question is to be found in the June number of the same journal where there is published a symposium: "Shall German supplant Latin?"

Oscar Browning, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, says he has "read Mr. Eve's article on this subject with great interest," and he agrees "both with its conclusion and with the argument by which it is enforced." Mr. Browning mentions, by the way, that he "took a high

[1] *Education*, Lond., Eng., May, 1890, p. 88.

classical degree at Cambridge," and "spent the next fifteen years in teaching Greek and Latin at a public school"; so he knows whereof he writes. Mr. Glazebrook, Head-Master of Manchester Grammar School, and E. A. Sonnenschein, Professor of Classics in Mason College, Birmingham, go far to support the arguments of Mr. Eve, who is Head-Master of the University College School.

There is no more common defence of the classics than the assertion that they are the only basis upon which "a good English style" can be built up. We frequently meet with passages like this: "The influence of the classical languages, which, so far as any teaching can develop a sense of literary style, are unrivalled just because they involve mental exertion;" or this: "It is almost superfluous to remark that almost every literary artist of the English language of our generation has been trained in classics, from the poets Tennyson, Browning, Arnold and Swinburne, to the leaders of science such as Professor Huxley." Just what the first of these expressions of opinion means one is at a loss to conjecture, since it is so qualified as to render it almost innocent of assertion. As to the second, the absence of argument is but too characteristic.

Let us see how men think on these matters. Dasent, an English writer of some eminence states: "I think I know good writing when I see it, and I must say that some who had great classical reputation have been the worst English writers I have known. I have observed this over and over again."[1]

Prof. John Earl of Oxford University, the author of a valuable work on English prose, expresses the opinion regarding classical training, "that it is excellent for some purposes, but not for forming an English style."[2]

These opinions are quite in line with those of many German authorities referred to in another portion of this essay. When we remember that no less an authority than Walter Savage Landor remarked, that "if we wish

[1] *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, Vol. XXIV., p. 414.

[2] *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, April, 1891, p. 128.

to write well, we must keep Greek and Latin out of sight," we may be excused for wondering that any one should cite Tennyson to illustrate the benefits of classics upon literary style. For the Laureate has taken the saying of Landor so much to heart that he has used in his poems a vocabulary that sometimes contains more than 70 % of good old English words. As to Browning, the following apt reference of James Russell Lowell is quite *à propos*: "Browning, in the preface to his translation of the Agamemnon, says, bluntly, as is his wont, 'learning Greek teaches Greek and nothing else.' One is sometimes tempted to think that it teaches some other language far harder than Greek when one tries to read his translation."[1] Of Swinburne some wicked critics have said that he but too well illustrates the chaste and beautiful style of such classical masters as Horace and Ovid but too often prove themselves to be. Matthew Arnold's authority is a little weakened by the cruel remark of Dr. Lowell: "I question the validity of single verses, or even of three or four, as examples of style, whether grand or other, and I think he [Arnold] would have made an opponent very uncomfortable who should have ventured to discuss Homer with as little knowledge of Greek as he himself apparently had of Old French when he commented on the 'Chanson de Roland.'"[2] And the classicists are quite welcome to all the crumbs of comfort they can pick up from the writings of Huxley[3] on the value of the ancient languages for stylistic or any other purposes. It might be worth while to refer here to the name of Herbert Spencer, whose opinions on the utility of the classics do not find an echo in the hearts of those who so eagerly cite the name of Prof. Huxley.

In Britain also the feeling in favour of teaching Greek as if it were a living tongue, and not a collection of philo-

[1] Loc. cit., p. 14.

[2] Loc. cit., p. 14.

[3] What Huxley's real opinions are may be judged from the following statement: "The classics are as little suited to be the staple of a liberal education as paleontology." ("Cycl. of Educ.," p. 59.) And Locke, the eminent philosopher, were he now living, would share the same view. (*See* Quick, "Educ., Ref.," p. 94.)

sophic quibbles and dead etymologies, is growing, as can be seen from an article by Prof. J. S. Blackie, which appeared last year in the *Scottish Review*.

There is also arising a feeling that the ancient Semitic languages have been but too long neglected in favour of the Greek and Latin, and it does seem as if the "classic" tongues would soon have to gird on their armour to fight this new competitor.

On the whole the classics in the British Isles are being subjected to the same criticism as in continental Europe and America; and it may be said that there, as elsewhere, their "right divine" has received a shock from which it will never be able to recover.

FRANCE.

In France, where classicism was formerly most strongly seated, signs of a change to come are apparent, which scholars like MM. Bréal, Janet, G. Bossier, and others, have pointed out. M. P. M. Berthelot admits that the future may entail the abolition of the classical languages in the schools.[1] An interesting epitome of the state of opinion in France in the year 1886 is to be found in the report of the Committee on Special Secondary Education presented to the Council of Public Instruction, and adopted July 27, 1886.[2] The chief subject of discussion was the nature of the new system to be established. "It was to be general and classical; it ought to be organized in such a manner as to respond to the new needs of modern society, and to attract towards the French secondary studies the young people who have neither the taste nor the leisure to devote themselves to the study of the dead languages." And in presenting the report of the commit-

[1] Rev. intern. de l'Enseign. Sixième Année, 1886, p. 367.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 353-367.

tee, M. E. Rabier (a classicist in sympathies) remarked that "the suppression, or, at least, the gradual extinction, of the present classical instruction was the end towards which tends, intentionally or unintentionally, the proposed reform." Although the majority of the committee were imbued with the classical spirit, nevertheless they reported in favour of attributing a relatively great importance to the study of the living languages, and of so organizing the school-courses that a second living language became obligatory beginning with the fourth year. The decree of the 8th of August, and the circular letter of the Minister of Public Instruction, dated Sept. 29, 1886, contain further important information.[1] While M. Goblet, the Minister, and the Superior Council of Public Instruction were then in favour of preserving the preponderance of the classics, they were compelled to give way in some respects to the new spirit of reform, especially as regards the teaching of the modern languages and the making of Greek optional in certain departments of study. Not a little of the credit for the result so far achieved is due to M. P. M. Berthelot, Inspector General of Superior Instruction, a member of the Institute, and one by no means eager for the immediate suppression of classical studies, but in favour of such a reform as will bring the schools more in line with the aspects and demands of modern culture and civilization. M. Berthelot has laboured hard, and with great success, to obtain the compulsory teaching of two modern languages (other than French), a thing which the Government at first declared to be impracticable, and to open to those engaged in such studies the baccalaureate, the liberal and industrial professions, and even the doctorate in Sciences and the professoriate in the Faculties.

Some interesting facts are contained in the paper of M. Louis Weill, in the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement*, for July, 1890,[2] from which we can learn a great deal regarding the progress of the study of modern languages

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 361-367.

[2] État actuel de l'enseignement des langues vivantes dans l'éducation des garçons en France, Rev. int. de l'Ens., Dixième Année, 1890, pp., 33-53.

in France. The rapid strides which the modern languages have made as subjects of instruction in the past twenty years are remarkable and augur well for the future. In Paris, Nancy, Lyon, Lille, Caen, Bordeaux, Rennes, Aix, Poictiers, etc., the attention paid to the study of the English, German, Italian and Spanish languages is worthy of comment, to say nothing of the increased value attached of late years by Frenchmen of all classes to the study of their mother tongue. By the decrees of December 25, 1880, and of July 28, 1886, there was instituted the "licence ès lettres avec mention 'langues vivantes,'" which, while it did not entirely free the students of modern languages from the burden of dead syntax and barbarous phonetics, was yet a step in advance. M. Weill gives many details which I have not space to enumerate, but it suffices to say, that modern languages are slowly, but surely, displacing the classics, and the time is not far distant when they will be the most important subject of instruction in the secondary schools.

In 1886 appeared the fifth edition of the work of Michel Bréal (a member of the Institute and a Professor in the Collège de France) on public instruction in France,[1] and it is an interesting work for the perusal of classicists, since the distinguished author has made a lasting name for himself in the fields of classical and comparative philology. M. Bréal lays before us very many valuable data regarding the position of the dead and the living languages in the schools, lyceums and faculties, and their history.[2]

M. Bréal is a strong supporter of the teaching of Latin, but not a bigoted one, as can be seen by his remarks on Latin prose and verse exercises. Of Greek he says: "In spite of the efforts of some eminent masters Greek has never been able truly to become acclimated in the University."[3]

---

[1] Quelques Mots sur l'Instruction publique en France. Cinquième édition, Paris, 1886.

[2] The parts of the book dealing with the Lycées (pp. 152-326), and Facultés (pp. 327-401) are particularly interesting.

[3] Op. cit., p. 227.

This is due in great measure to the strange methods of teaching the language, according to M. Bréal, methods of teaching, which are simply ridiculous in many respects, when compared with the advance in instruction in modern languages. M. Bréal speaks favourably of the modern languages, and of their struggle for just recognition in the colleges, which bids fair to be crowned with complete success.

In the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* for March, 1891, M. Th. Ferneuil reviews the work of M. A. Fouillée on "l'Enseignement au Point de vue National,"[1] and brings to bear many interesting arguments in favour of the study of the modern languages. M. Fouillée is an ardent classicist and does not like to see the Latin nations "denying their ancestors, and, by a species of intellectual ingratitude, preparing the decadence of their national spirit." The arguments he uses in support of Latin vary from the supposition that the success of the Universal Exposition of 1889 was due to the influence of the ancient languages and classic traditions, to the assertion that Latin still represents the literature of Christianity, and that it ought to be made an international speech. But the time devoted to Latin would be at the expense of Greek. M. Fouillée, as M. Ferneuil points out, presents an excellent example of the *Habemus confitentem* when he coolly remarks:—

"We are not a neo-Greek nation; we are a neo-Latin nation, and our literature is inspired by Greece only through Latin. Greek is a marvel, but one which reveals itself only to a profound study such as in truth we cannot expect from our 60,000 collegians." This expression of opinion, however, weighs heavily upon the writer's conscience, and he seeks to lessen his sin by stating: "In sacrificing Greek, we must veil our face as did Agamemnon when he sacrificed Iphigenia." In order to clear the way for Latin, M. Fouillée sorrowfully proceeds to the despatch of that "fairest speech the world has seen," a truly classical sacrifice.

M. Ferneuil takes occasion to remark: "During a cer-

[1] Pp. 217-234.

tain phase of the evolution of history, the dead languages could form the common foundation of secondary studies; but for the societies of the present, the axis of human knowledge has changed its place. It no longer gravitates around the classical studies, because, whether we will it or not, the dead languages no longer possess, as formerly, a monopoly, but have become simply a special branch of general culture. To-day the essential elements of that culture comprise the national language and literature, the modern languages, and the principles of the positive and moral sciences. This is the common and indispensable course for all the citizens of modern societies, whatever may be their future destiny, whilst the ancient languages and literatures constitute a particular category of knowledge which appeals to only a restricted circle of avocations."[1]

The concluding remarks of M. Ferneuil sum up the state of affairs in France at the present moment:—

"Those who favour the rational and normal reform of secondary education speak here as sad but disinterested witnesses, for they know that time is on their side, that the fatal evolution of ideas and contemporary facts moves on in spite of all resistance towards the more or less near realization of their *desiderata*, which may be thus summed up: the relegation of classical culture to a minority of pupils alone qualified to receive it, and the diversifying of the programmes of study according to the vocation of the young people."[2]

The question of secondary education was discussed at length in the French Senate, in the debate of June 17-19, 1890, which was occasioned by an interpellation of M. Combes regarding "the necessity of instituting without delay important modifications in the organization of our system of secondary instruction." The official report of the debate is printed in the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* for July, 1890,[3] and in the same number an able comment on the discussion appears over the signature of M. Edmond Dreyfus-Brisac, the editor of the *Revue*."[4]

[1] Op. cit., p. 225. [2] Op. cit., p. 234. [3] Pp. 73-93. [4] Pp. 1-16.

M. Combes, from whose interpellation of the government the debate arose, is one of the advocates of reform in the secondary schools, and his opinions are in brief as follows: "The common education, calculated to serve for all without exception, cannot be an education by means of Greek and Latin; it can have as a base only the mother-tongue and the modern languages, for horizons only the modern horizons, for programmes of study only those subjects of knowledge, without which one is behind the age, and is not reckoned amongst the well-educated people of his country."[1] Later on in life students may choose, according to their bent, the study of classics or the further study of the modern tongues, but the elementary basis above indicated they ought all to have.

At the conclusion of M. Combes' remarks, M. Jules Simon, with all the eloquence and power of imagination that he possesses, entered the arena on behalf of the classics, and, with fervid oratory and well-turned periods, presented their cause in all its sentimental aspects. While favouring more complete instruction in the modern languages, M. Simon would never consent to the abolition of the study of the classic tongues, to teach which is the duty of Frenchmen to France, and of France to humanity.

M. Simon was followed by M. Chalamet, who declared himself "un partisan impénitent de l'éducation classique," but not so blind a one that he could not see the need for some reform.

Perhaps the most important part of the discussion was the speech of M. Bourgeois, the Minister of Public Instruction, who came after M. Chalamet, a speech which is well worthy careful attention, since the minister approaches the question of reform in a rather liberal spirit. His proposal is to place the modern languages and the classics on such a footing with regard to each other that justice will be done to both.

The importance of the discussion may be judged from the answer which the Minister of Education gave to M. Bardoux, who insisted on a categorical reply to his ques-

[1] P. 74.

tion, "Is not the existence of the classics at stake?" The answer of M. Bourgeois was brief, but expressive: "Yes, of some of them."

M. Dreyfus-Brisac, commenting upon the debate, expresses the opinion that Greek must be abolished and the modern languages given wider scope:—

"Ce qui est à l'ordre du jour, ce n'est pas la question du latin, c'est la question du grec."

If one wishes to get a further idea of the progress the study of the modern languages has made in France in the last few years, let him read the interesting article of Ludwig Fleischner, of Vienna, "Das Studium der fremden Sprachen in Frankreich."[1] The optional modern languages in France are English, German, Italian, Spanish, Arabic, besides, of course, the mother-tongue. And the leaven has already begun to work, so much so that distinguished educationalists no longer hesitate to favour the suppression of the ancient and the further encouragement of the modern languages Evidently there are heretics abroad in France, who do not believe in the "divine right" of the classics.

ITALY.

Even in Italy, that classic land, there are signs of a new awakening. What the state of affairs was in the last few years may be read in the article of M. Georges Lafaye in the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* for October, 1886,[2] in which a concise sketch is given of the valuable work of M. Cremona on higher education. Up to 1875, the door of the Faculties opened only to such students as presented the *licenza liceale*, or diploma of classical instruction in the secondary schools. But in that year an edict

[1] Zeitschrift für das Realschulwesen. Wien, 1891, S. 65-79.

[2] Sixième Année, 1886, pp. 281-296.

was issued which permitted youths trained in a special technical institute, who presented diplomas in mathematics and physics, to enter the faculty of the sciences, and, by further instruction, to become engineers. If they desired to take a doctor's degree, however, they had to undergo a supplementary examination on ancient and national literature, but it is to be supposed, as M. Lafaye remarks, that the examination was not very exacting for candidates who knew neither Greek nor Latin. And, having once begun, it will not be long before Italy, bound by history and tradition to the classics, opens the remaining professions on similar terms. That the classical question is troubling the minds of educators in the Italian peninsula, as well as in the rest of Europe, needs no demonstration. M. Lafaye, who remarks that one would suppose that the study of the ancient languages ought to be in a more flourishing state in Italy than elsewhere, quotes the following passage from M. Cremona :—

"We must indeed acknowledge that in this country the study of Greek gives no result; so much is this the case that eminent defenders of classical philology have advocated its suppression. If we suppress it in our classical lyceums, to avoid the loss of time which it entails, we shall be, except as regards the existing difference in the stability of pedagogical methods, on a level with the Prussian Realschulen of the first order, the certificated pupils of which are admitted to the university only with great difficulty and under certain well-defined conditions. But there are those of our compatriots who would descend still further, and who, with a light heart, would abandon even Latin, the language of our fathers, the language graven on the monuments which meet our eyes, the language which is studied with love by every cultivated foreigner, and the language by which we learn to know a past, the possession of which the world envies us. Notwithstanding these melancholy reflexions, I cannot conceal the fact that in the central committee of the Senate several of our honourable colleagues have expressed the opinion that it is no longer permissible to impose upon our entire youth the sacrifice of useful studies demanded by the tendencies of modern

civilization, in order to devote them to the study and pursuit of a civilization that has been buried for centuries."[1]

This confession coming from M. Cremona, who is one of the ablest, as he is one of the most eloquent, defenders of the classics, is most interesting.

Prof. Cesare Lombroso, of Turin, whose name is known in scientific circles throughout the world, nay, is a household word wherever the cause of social progress, and the preservation of what is good in society, are studied, does not hesitate to fearlessly proclaim his desire to secure the abolition of classical studies in Italy, which he regards as an absolute necessity. This declaration, made in the year 1891, by so eminent a scholar and scientist, ought to warn some of the ultra-classicists of the revolution to come.

HUNGARY.

In Hungary there has been for a long time strong opposition to compulsory Greek in the Gymnasia, and the recent decision of the Minister of Education has attracted much attention. A short sketch of the struggle that has terminated in making Greek optional, with the prospect that it will be entirely abolished in the not very distant future, is given by Prof. Dr. Fr. Kemény, of Kronstadt, in his article, "The Greek Campaign in Hungary."[2] The land of Kossuth had for many long years been growing restless under the fetters of classicism, and from the rugged Carpathians to the shores of the Adriatic, all over the

[1] In the *Monist*, Vol. I., No. 3 (April, 1891), p. 361.

[2] Der griechische Feldzug in Ungarn. In the "Zeitschrift für das Realschulwesen, Wien, 1891. XV. Jahrgang, VI. Heft, S. 341-348, VII. Heft, S. 416-425. See also: Pädagogisches Archiv, Stettin, 1890, XXXII. Jahrgang, Nr. 4, Mai 1890, S. 240-249. Compare also Prof. Dr. J. Kvacsala's article: "Zur Frage des Griechischen in Ungarn," in "Pædagogium" (Leipzig), XII. Jahrgang, IV. Heft, Januar, 1890, S. 223-228.

Hungarian provinces, the warning notes of the revolution to come became louder and louder, until the protest burst forth on the floor of Parliament in May, 1889. Deputy after deputy spoke in favour of making the Realschulen of more practical use for the people, and amid lively applause the Minister of Education declared that the first subject to be stricken out of the curriculum must be Greek. The contest called forth the full strength of the Philhellenes, and the arguments used by them are the same oft-told ones that are familiar to us in America. The real question at issue in Hungary was: "whether, in the nineteenth century, a man unacquainted with Greek could lay claim to the possession of a liberal education," and so far all has gone in favour of the affirmative. In May, 1889, the Minister of Education had promised to look into the matter carefully and expressed himself as favourably disposed towards making Greek optional. In the early part of the year 1890 the question came up for discussion and settlement in the Hungarian Lower House, where a nine days' debate (from January 21 to February 1) ensued. The Philhellenes repeated their old arguments that education "was impossible without a knowledge of the noblest language ever spoken by man," and that Greek was superior to all other tongues as a means of culture. The Anti-Hellenes protested against compulsory instruction in a dead language while so much of modern life and civilization lay around untouched. The following outline of the discussion may be of interest:—[1]

Count Csáky, the Minister of Education, laid before the House the principles upon which he intended to act during his term of office, and intimated that Greek was to be made optional. Deputy Kovács, of the extreme left, replied, protesting against the abolition of Greek, to which the Minister rejoined that his intention was not at present to abolish that language. The next speaker, Madarász, of the extreme left, declared that "he considered a dead

[1] See report of the debate in the Pädagogisches Archiv (Stettin), XXIII. Jahrgang, Nr. 4, May, 1890, S. 240-249. See also, for extended report of Asbóth's speech, "Pædagogium," XII., Jahrgang (1890), S. 784-6.

language as an improper and unfit means of imparting living culture." For this reason he was also opposed to the systematic teaching of Latin in the schools, and believed that the languages of which a knowledge ought to be acquired were German, French and English, "languages that enable us to appreciate the colossal achievements of modern civilization and culture." Deputy Zay, a jurist and member of the opposition, considered the proposal of the Minister to consult the parents of the school-children on the matter demagogical, and sarcastically suggested that "the lazy children should be asked whether they liked to study Greek or not." Amid loud applause the Minister rose and said: "That it was his firm opinion that in this branch of learning, as in others, the wishes of the parents ought to be consulted, and furthermore, he hesitated not to say, that when it shall become necessary he would willingly listen to the children themselves."

Deputy Asbóth (Ministerialist) spoke next. The burden of his remarks was this: If these studies are thrown overboard, it will be proclaimed to the world that Hungary has withdrawn from the ranks of the nations of liberal culture. This opinion he defended in eloquent words. He was answered by Deputy Schvarcz, of the Government party, who, besides being a distinguished historian, is considered the best Greek scholar in Hungary.[1] The principal points in his speech were these:—

It was a question of removing Greek to make room for something else, and making the pursuit of that language optional would not annihilate the study of it.

The first argument used by the Philhellenes is that Greek is superior to all other languages as a means of mental culture. This opinion, and the great hold that Greek has upon German educationists, are in great part to be explained by the fact that it has been handed down as an heirloom from generation to generation, and no due

[1] It is noteworthy that in the Hungarian campaign the Anti-Hellenes were nearly all men who had gone through the Gymnasia and who knew Greek.

enquiry has been made as to its real comparative merits.

Amid cheers, Deputy Schvarcz continued: "There dwells not in the literature of Greece the magic power that is ascribed to it. For, in part, it is only the modern English, French and German literature that has given it its renown and splendour, and the old Táblabiró, in defining those works as classical, the commentaries of which are more beautiful than the original text, was not so wrong after all in a certain sense."

The second great argument for the retention of Greek is "the sublimity of its literature." But however high an opinion we may form of the great writers of antiquity, when we consider the gigantic strides which the nineteenth century has made in intellectual advancement, we cannot but feel how narrow in comparison with this progress are the mental horizons of Homer, Æschylus, Demosthenes, nay even Plato or Aristotle.

Another reason for compulsory Greek is "the beneficial influence of the Greek mind." This influence will in no way be abolished, if the study of the language is made optional. Those to whose interest it is to study Greek will study it, and those to whom it is of no importance will be relieved of a useless burden.

Prof. Pulszky ventured the opinion that the scholars in the Technical High School, who had been prepared in the Gymnasia, were superior to those who came from the Realschulen, and considered that making Greek optional would lower the level of the Gymnasia.

This opinion was directly controverted by Prof. Jonas of the Technical High School, who declared that the pupils from the Realschulen were better prepared for technical studies.

Deputy Ordódy (a Government supporter) believed that the idea that the study of Greek had any especially beneficial influence upon character, was an antiquated notion. Every science could form mind and character. In the reform proposed by the Minister he saw the first step towards a proper organization of the intermediate schools.

Deputy Ugrón (an independent) declared that "the study of the classical languages in the intermediate schools

was a tradition that had come down to us from the past; to-day it was no longer necessary. The intermediate schools, paid for out of the public treasury, ought to teach that which is of greatest benefit to the people at large. It is said that Greek is the great instrument of mental culture; but why, when mankind has reached the manhood of culture, should it seek to return to its childhood? Why should we grasp after the spirit of three thousand years ago, that long since has ceased to be able to compete with that of to-day? To inculcate the youth in the intermediate schools with the 'Greek spirit' is a pure waste of time. Their instruction should be such that they are prepared for their vocations in life, and are not compelled later on to get rid of a mass of useless knowledge. Greek should be relegated to the University."

Deputy Helfy, a journalist and a member of the left, spoke in favour of optional Greek, but would require "in any case only as much as every scholar of normal talents could learn in six months."

This debate is one of the most important that has taken place for many years. It shows that in that country where Latin lingered longest as a living tongue, and where Greek influence might reasonably be supposed to be very strong, a great revolution has taken place in education. From all parts of the country came promises of support to the Minister, and the vast majority of the House irrespective of party politics declared themselves in favour of his proposals.

The remarks of the press on the discussion are instructive. Commenting on the debate of February, the well-known *Pester Lloyd* said: "Without exaggeration it can reasonably be maintained that Count Csáky in removing Greek from the list of obligatory subjects in the intermediate schools, and in creating the uniform intermediate schools, had reached the very heart of the house of deputies, the very heart of the Hungarian nation." It points out the fact that Deputy Schvarcz, "the greatest Hellenist that Hungary ever possessed," used all his learning and powers of argumentative eloquence on behalf of the

effort to rid the scholars of the intermediate schools of the burden hitherto imposed upon them.

The *Egyetértés*, a prominent Opposition journal, advised the minister to ignore the opposition of professional cliques, and to rely upon the declaration of the popular mind upon the matter; the schools were not for the teachers but for the children; education was no mere personal affair of the professors, but the common concern of the whole nation. In order, however, not to be over-hasty, the Minister of Education called together to consult with him a committee of eighteen men, representing various intellectual callings, and most of them Philhellenes. This committee sat from the 24th to the 26th of March and considered the question in all its bearings. The Minister had, on the 4th of March, issued a preliminary edict, and on April 21 the final decision on the matter was submitted to the House of Deputies, and is now the law of the land. Besides minor changes of a liberal and progressive nature, the new law enacts as follows:—[1]

The four hours a week previously taken up by Greek are, with those not taking that language, to be assigned thus in Class V., and correspondingly in the other classes of the Gymnasia: I. (*a*) Hungarian prose and verse selections, (*b*) reading translations of portions of Thucydides with commentaries, and Greek antiquities. II. Elements of free-hand drawing. The compromise agreed upon for the present is that those who avail themselves of the option take instead of Greek the reading of Hungarian and Greek classic writers (the latter in Hungarian translations only), and the elements of free-hand drawing. In the highest class (Class VIII.) the substitutes are: I. (*a*) Readings from the more prominent modern prose writers of Hungary, (*b*) A drama of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides (in translation only). History of Greek literature. II. Elements of geometrical drawing.

If we substitute for Hungarian in the above scheme, English, we shall see that even in Hungary, for half a cen-

[1] See "Zeitschrift für Realschulwesen" (Wien, 1891), XVI. Jahrgang, I. Heft., S. 27.

tury fast bound in the fetters of classicism, a great overturn in educational principles has already taken place, and the future seems to promise still further developments in the same line.

Evidently that terror of the classicists, the *Zeitgeist*, has been abroad amongst the Magyars.

GERMANY.

A vast deal has been said about the inaugural address of Prof. Hofmann, of Berlin, and the written protest of the "philosophical faculty" of the University, to both of which great and unreasonable importance has been attached. To read the effusions of the ultra-classicists one would suppose that the question at issue had been settled forever, but such is not the case; the advocates of reform are forcing the fight, and it will not be long ere the victory be entirely theirs. The few successes that have fallen to the lot of the classic hosts have been Pyrrhic victories; a few more such and the worshippers of the past will be utterly undone. The purport of the Hofmann manifesto has been misconceived and its importance hugely exaggerated. At the utmost it was a declaration that at the present moment, and under present circumstances, the modern languages are not an equivalent for the classic tongues in the universities. As for the protest of the "philosophical faculty," it is not certain that this was not a case of "We are the people, and wisdom shall die with us," if we may alter a little the words used by that sage of old who excelled even our own Shakespeare in his ignorance of Greek and Latin. What the real state of affairs was in Germany about this time is to be seen from the interesting paper of Prof. E. James, in the *Popular Science Monthly*, for 1884,[1] on "The

[1] Vol. XXIV. (1884), pp. 289-306.

Classical Question in Germany," and the article of Prof. F. A. Fernall, published a short time afterwards in the same periodical.[1] From these we learn that the Hofmann edict did practically nothing to stem the tide that is slowly but surely rising against the present system of classical instruction. The gulf between the classical and the practical and humanistic school is growing wider and wider, and not a few Curtiuses have already leaped into the chasm in vain attempt to appease the angered deities. The protest of the Berlin professors is but the old and familiar case of the smiths of Ephesus, for "if the new theory be true their craft is at an end." Curiously enough, about the same time that the much-talked-of speech of Prof. Hofmann was, by the careful assiduity of the partizans of the classics, being scattered broad-cast and welcomed in America and elsewhere, by the supporters of the "college fetish," as manna from heaven, another rectorial address saw the light of day. On the 3rd of January, 1881, the University of Würzburg celebrated the 299th anniversary of its foundation. Dr. Wislicenus, the rector, devoted his remarks to the subject of "The Admission of Graduates of the Realschulen to University Studies."[2] Perhaps those who so ardently admire the address of the Berlin rector have not taken the trouble to look into that of his colleague of Würzburg. If they have done so, the eyes of some of them at least must have been opened, and widely too, for, on certain points, Dr. Wislicenus boldly takes up the gauntlet thrown down by the Professor of Chemistry, and by statistics and logical arguments destroys his case. Dr. Wislicenus declares that he is not able to see the great dangers threatened by the development of the Realschulen and the proposed division of the philosophical faculty, which has existed for some time in certain German universities. Prof. Hofman's use of the name of the eminent scientist Liebig in defence of his own views, is shown by Dr. Wislicenus to be most unjustifiable,

[1] Vol. XXVI. (1885), pp. 20-30.

[2] The address is published under the title: "De l' admission des bacheliers des Réalschulen aux études universitaires," in the Revue de l'enseignement internationale, Tome II., 1881, pp. 297-318.

the evidence from his writings going far to favour the advocates of the Realschulen. The statistics given by Dr. Wislicenus regarding the examinations of the secondary schools in mathematics, sciences, and modern languages, undergone by pupils of the Gymnasia and of the Realschulen absolutely deprive of value the personal experiences of Dr. Hofmann. Besides this, Dr. Wislicenus' own experience is to the effect that, in his department of science, the pupils of the Realschulen were quite the equals, and very often the superiors, of those of the Gymnasia. But the choice morsel of the address for the dyed-in-the-wool classicists is this:—

"Contrary to a very wide-spread opinion, and one to which I, myself, have long adhered, according to which students coming from the Gymnasia should distinguish themselves, in general, by facility in the use of language and by rigour of logic in speech and style, I have often been astonished, in going through beforehand the works of my particular pupils for their doctor's thesis, to see that it was precisely those of the former pupils of the Gymnasia that betrayed a singular awkwardness in the use of the mother-tongue, when it was required to give an account of the results of experimental research with which a long practice in the subject had made them entirely familiar. Too often have I been forced to return them to their authors in order that they might remodel the style and structure, and many times I have even had to make here and there many retouchings with the red pencil."

Dr. Wislicenus says that his experiences are fully borne out by those of his colleague, Prof. Fick. According to the latter the state of the language of the works in medicine (which are all written by men of a classical education) is "simply barbarous," and he speaks of the awkwardness and obscurity of expression, too often met with, as "at times truly incredible."

It is needless, perhaps, to state that Dr. Wislicenus is heartily in favour of permitting the graduates of the Realschulen to enter the faculty of medicine.[1] The idea that

[1] Compare: Dr. Schenk and Dr. Kohn in "Zeitung für das höhere Unterrichtswesen, Nr. 50, 1879. See also Schmeding, Op. cit., p. 34.

the student of medicine has any more need of a purely gymnasial training than has the future mathematician, or the naturalist, or even the teacher of modern languages, he characterizes as simply illogical.

Since the year 1880 there have appeared in Germany many interesting works dealing with the classical question, which the expounders of the address of Prof. Hofmann have not taken the trouble to translate into English for the benefit of their Greek- and Latin-minded youth. Of some of the more important of these I shall endeavour to give a brief account, but of a few only, since the literature on the subject has assumed vast proportions, the " crushing blow " of the Berlin address and protest not having sufficed to prevent the advocates of reform from continuing their active propaganda before the public with steadily increasing success. Valuable information regarding the history of the subject is to be found in the works of Specht[1] and Paulsen.[2] In only two years from the date of Prof. Hofmann's pronunciamento, we learn that, by the revised programme of 1882, the time of commencing Greek was removed from the fourth to the third grade, Greek lost two hours and Latin nine hours, while natural sciences, mathematics, and modern languages gained correspondingly. Dr. Paulsen, a Berlin professor, fully anticipates the entire abolition of compulsory studies in Latin and Greek, and the " so-called classical basis of education " will no longer be demanded. Prof. Paulsen takes occasion to point out that devotion to Latin has in many cases contributed very greatly to ruin German style, and that the best guides for true facility in the use of the mother-tongue are the reading of good German, and well-directed exercises in that language. That day is now come of which Jacob Grimm so eloquently spoke, when the German tongue should be the first and foremost instrument of culture for

[1] Geschichte des Unterrichtswesens in Deutschland von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Mitte des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts. Stuttgart, 1885.

[2] Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten von Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den klassischen Unterricht. Leipzig, 1885.

the German people. The gain to be achieved by the abandonment of the so-called classical basis is much greater than is supposed to be the case by many, and the loss far less. The declaration that the way to the University lay only through the classical Gymnasia was riddled with holes by the decrees of 1870, and since then many similar contentions have been dismantled and overthrown.

In a later work,[1] Prof. Paulsen discusses the subject of higher education at considerable length, reiterating the views formerly expressed by him. He recognizes as one of the most important signs of the times, the rapid spread of the idea that in all the schools of Germany the centre of instruction must be the German Language, and the tendency is to extend more and more the limits of instruction in the mother tongue. If an ancient language is to be studied let us first of all look to the older stages of our own language with its noble literature.

Then come the modern languages, French and English, most important from both a stylistic and an historical point of view. Instead of beginning with Latin, as the ultra-classicists demand, we should begin with the foreign living languages, which appeal to us more in every way, and which in the world of thought and action to-day are vastly more important.[2]

Prof. Paulsen is cruel enough to say that "the superstition that the Latin language is the incarnation of logic," has been exposed by Dr. Schlee of the Altona Realgymnasium, who shows how lacking in precision that language is when compared with German.[3] The remarks of Prof. Paulsen upon the stylistic and historico-literary value of the modern languages are well worth careful attention. In regard to both of these the modern tongues have nothing to fear from a comparison with the ancient.

"It is often said that without the knowledge of the ancient languages and their literature a deeper compre-

[1] Das Realgymnasium und die humanistische Bildung. Berlin, 1889, S. 71.

[2] The method of teaching French before Latin has been pursued with great success in the Altona Realgymnasium and elsewhere.

[3] See Pädagogisches Archiv, April, 1889.

hension of our own literature is impossible. Now it were a question whether the influence of the French and English literatures upon the development of German, has not gone a good deal deeper than that of the ancient languages."

"The effect of Shakespeare upon our great writers is indeed deeper and wider than that of Homer and of Sophocles. And then too, the influence of no philosopher of antiquity can be mentioned beside the enormous and wide-spread activity of Voltaire, and after him of Rousseau. Indeed, towards the end of the last century the German world lived and moved in Rousseau: Kant and Herder, Goethe and Schiller, Basedow and Pestalozzi, in whatever direction we look we see the effects of the immense stimuli which proceeded from this rare and strange man."

So much for the past of Germany, what of the present? If in the years long gone by the influence of the ancient languages and literatures upon German thought has been no greater than that of the modern, what chance is there of its being greater in the world of to-day? "To be sure, there are individuals who, in their hours of leisure, are wont to take up Homer or Thucydides, Horace or Tacitus, but the many do not so; in such a case they take up a German book, or, if it be a foreign one, Shakespeare or Molière, Dickens or Daudet, Carlyle, or Taine, or what else may be at hand. The use of French and of English books in Germany depends upon the demand of the great reading public; the demand for Greek and Latin books depends upon the artificial impulse of the schools. No bookseller will doubt this."

"It is conceivable enough that opinions should differ as to the absolute value of English and Greek poetry, but in any case the English lies nearer to our feelings and to our understanding; it is our world, which is pictured in it; in it are the questions that excite us most, the joys that make us happy. And so it is with the historical and philosophical literature, to say nothing at all of the scientific. Mill and Spencer are nearer to us than Plato and Aristotle. I am an ardent admirer of these Greek philosophers, but the fact still remains that it is not the immediate interest that leads us to them, the longing after instruction

or even after contradiction, which, too, is a sort of instruction, and not the most inoperative. A German token of this lies in the fact that no refutations of Plato and Aristotle are written. Mill and Spencer are disputed, which means that they are living authors; they busy themselves with our problems, they think our thoughts, and perhaps also our errors."

"The teachers of the modern languages and literatures are the chosen bearers of the idea of the unity of the western peoples in the past and of their solidarity in the future." The idea that the books of the ancients are the sources of all knowledge has passed away forever. The Latin language has more claims to be taught than has the Greek, for it is often a link between the old and the new, and for certain philological purposes it is indispensable. Its hours can be reduced. But the head and front of the offending of the reformers is that they desire to expel the Greek from the Realgymnasium, or rather that they have done so already. Its abolition is a necessity, and the gain is far greater than the loss.

In 1885 Prof. Dr. F. Schmeding, of the Realgymnasium at Duisburg, published his critical study of modern classical education,[1] which contains a vast amount of useful information regarding the various questions in dispute between the old and new schools of educators. He discusses at length the monopoly of classics and its effects, and brings serious charges against it, which necessitate its discontinuance. Dr. Schmeding details his own experiences and those of others, which all lead to the conclusion that the study of the ancient classics is shorn of its glory and must take its place humbly in the background. He refers at some length to the Berlin address and protest, which seem the stock-in-trade of the classicists, and which have travelled round the world in various guises in the service of revered antiquity. The evidence he produces as to the teaching of the classic languages in the German Gymnasia and its results is irresistible; the pure waste of

[1] Die classische Bildung in der Gegenwart. Berlin, 1885.

time is simply incredible.[1] Against the rhetoric of Prof. Hofmann, the solid facts must prevail; if the gymnasial students "breathe the ambrosial fragrance of Olympian Jove," it must be done under strange and fearful circumstances, for the atmosphere of the Gymnasia little conduces to produce the sublime and life-inspiring effluvia that are so often described to us.

It was not without reason that Bismarck, in a conversation with Disraeli in 1874, expressed his ardent desire to save Prussia from its Professors, when we consider the barrenness of their labours. It was no more nor less than the truth that was expressed by the distinguished economical student and professor, Émile de Laveleye, when he said:—

"Voyons les langues anciennes. On consacre six ans au latin et cinq au grec. Résultat net et incontestable: On sait peu le latin, et point du tout le grec." Or to use the apt expression of Goethe:—

> Was man nicht braucht, das eben lernet man,
> Und was man lernt, kann man nicht brauchen.

Bismarck may not have been very far out when, referring to Mommsen, one of the foremost classicists, he said, although not in direct reference to the study of classics: "Der Blick des ausgezeichneten Gelehrten, der mit der 2000 jährigen Vergangenheit der Geschichte vertraut ist, muss aber für die Sonne der Gegenwart vollständig getrübt sein!"[2] The anecdote related by Direktor Steinbart of Prof. Hanstein, who was dumbfounded to discover that his assistant was a graduate of the Realschule, shows that others have allowed the glamour of antiquity to blind them to the facts of the present.[3] And the celebrated Hofmann, according to Steinbart, was similarly undeceived, but failed to acknowledge the error of his ways. The objections of Prof. Schmeding to the classical basis may be summed up as follows:—

---

[1] See the remarks of Geheimrat Wiese (S. 18), Prof. Sybel (S. 19) etc. And of Bain and Farrar (S. 35).

[2] Cited by Schmeding, p. 42.

[3] Cited by Schmeding, p. 47.

1. The time devoted to the subject is for the most part wasted.

2. So-called "classical culture" hinders a proper appreciation of the present, by weakening the powers of comprehension and dulling sensitiveness to the world around us.

3. It hinders the elevation of the national welfare, for it fosters traditions and the worst elements of conservatism, and professes a certain contempt for mercantile and commercial pursuits.

4. It prevents the cultivation of other and more necessary branches of science.

These objections Prof. Schmeding supports with a wealth of illustration and argument, though some of them he appears to carry a little too far. The general spirit of the book is contained in the following lines which stand at the head of one of the chapters :—

Dies Geschlecht, das in Vokabeln
Wie der Ochs im Joche zieht,
Das in grauen Götterfabeln
Keine Gegenwart mehr sieht,

Dies Geschlecht, es schien geboren
Nur für Rom und für Athen,
Und wie Deutschland ging verloren
Liessen sie es gern geschehn.

Deutsche Jugend, Du von heute,
Voll von Griechisch und Latein,
Wirst auch Du der Vorwelt Beute,
Du auch uns verloren sein?

Wirbst auch Du um morsche Kränze,
In der toten Wissenschaft?
Weihst auch Du dem fremden Lenze
Deines Lebens Füll' und Kraft?

W. Preyer, who is well known as an investigator of the phenomena of childhood, published in 1887 his brochure "Naturforschung und Schule,"[1] in which are contained many interesting facts regarding higher education in Germany.

[1] Stuttgart, 1887, S. 48.

While he is a great admirer of Greek literature and of the Greek language, he is opposed to making it compulsory in the schools. The Latin composition he considers especially harmful, and notes with satisfaction that it is disappearing in many places. To quote his words:—

"To construct artificial periods, to conceal poverty of thought by terms of speech intended to be fine, or by bombastic turgidness of style, to repeat what others have often said already—that is what the Latin composition and the Latin oration of the German Gymnasia really demands and encourages." It is not reasonable that the youth should suppress the mother-tongue in favour of two dead foreign languages, and neglect the golden opportunity of learning the elements of the natural sciences, the modern languages, and modern history. Preyer points out that the physician and scientist need not of necessity know Greek or Latin, or be profound philologists. There is a movement strongly setting in in favour of ridding the German language of the countless Latin words and phrases that have been imported into the vocabulary by pedants. There is no necessity to run to the dead languages for the name of a new invention; the German tongue has resources enough to meet all demands. "Fernsprecher" is just as useful as, and much more sensible than, "Telephon." Preyer would have the schools freed from the burden of Latin and Greek: "Since, however, the schools exist not for the teachers but for the scholars, and our children do not go to school in order to save from ruin Greek and Latin instruction, or to develop into professors and savants, but in order to become strong, good, and educated men: we have, therefore, the right and the duty to co-operate in attaining this goal."

"The Latin instruction in the Realgymnasium is nothing else than a concession to classicism, an old roof on a new house, which does not hold in spite of all patchwork. It is like a leafless trunk in a young nursery which in spite of all care grows not, but remains stunted."

The mother-tongue must be the first language taught, and it must be taught thoroughly. The student should learn to read, write and speak German easily, fluently,

readily. Morals and religion should also be taught. Then, upon a phonetic basis, English and French ought to be taught more largely, on account of their great importance in the world of literature and science. The Heimatskunde, Geography and German history (no other history should be allowed to come first) should have a place of importance. Then the elements of drawing, geometry, arithmetic and algebra, as well as some of the natural sciences, hygiene and sociology. Towards the close of his little book Preyer, a classically trained man himself, thus eloquently protests against the ruinous devotion to the dead languages :—

" Such compulsion, anachronistic and unphysiological, hinders the natural development of the individual and the nation. We all, not merely the German naturalists and physicians, stand inwardly so far from classic antiquity, much farther than our grandfathers stood. We are so much more interested in other things, in what is living, real, present, we find it so much more stimulating, pleasant and agreeable for our children, that we are at last going to cease cutting our own flesh. Why should we continue to offer sacrifice to the classical idols upon the shattered altars of its ruined temples? The much better Christian view of the world stood always in opposition to it, and had no sympathy with it, and our sons are born not for the exaltation of the old, but for the appreciation of the new. As certain reptiles, which, through disuse, have lost the fins of their ancestors, but have retained as a useless appendage the bones which bore them, so we who are not philologists drag around with us as a burdensome rudimentary organ, the skeleton of the ancient languages taught in the schools, which were of some use to our ancestors, and we ask in vain : Wherefore? As little possible as it is for the eagle to crawl back into the egg, from the shell of which he burst forth with the strength of youth, is it for the present generation of men to be forced into the narrow, cracked shell of classicism, which served for our ancestors. Education is in reality a contest of two generations with each other, in which the victories of the younger always ultimately decide the

question. Therefore, the older generation is wise if it yields according as its strength gives way, instead of making desperate attempts to maintain a past that is no longer necessary, or obstinately seeking to survive out of harmony with the new."

Such are the opinions of one of Germany's ablest thinkers, and the seeds sown by him, and by others like-minded, are taking root throughout the length and breadth of the land. The harvest has nearly come.

In 1889 Dr. Paul Cauer, of the Royal Gymnasium at Kiel, published under the suggestive title, "*Suum Cuique*," five essays on the reform of higher education, in which he gives expression to moderate opinions with rather classical leanings. A glance at his pamphlet will show the far-reaching dimensions of the anti-classical agitation.

Paul Güszfeldt, in his little book, "Die Erziehung der deutschen Jugend," which reached its third edition in 1890, declares (though a lover of Greek himself) that the great devotion to classics in the schools must cease, and the place of the mere formal instruction in dead languages be taken by translations in German. The centre of instruction in language should be before all the mother tongue. French also ought to be taught, and one other foreign modern language, English. This pamphlet, which, it is said, has the approbation of the Emperor, is exerting considerable influence in Germany on behalf of the "New School."

In 1890 appeared another pamphlet, "Gymnasium und Universität," by Dr. Eduard Zeller, a Professor in the University of Berlin, and one of the signers of the much-quoted manifesto. Somewhat to our surprise, we learn that the worthy Professor declares that the question of the absolute requirement of classical training is not a general one, but merely relates to the German universities; it is classics as a university study that is indispensable, to his mind, to the student at such an institution of learning. If this be the state of the case, the value of the Hofmann manifesto and the Berlin protest do not carry weight in Canada, where university matters are different and where the institutions of learning are more in touch with the people. The following is a pertinent passage from his

book (p. 19): "Man kann gewisz ein gebildeter Mensch sein, wenn man auch keinen griechischen und keinen lateinischen Schriftsteller in der Ursprache zu lesen im Stande ist. Denn eines schickt sich nicht für alle: die Bildungsmittel und Bildungsformen des menschlichen Geistes sind mannigfaltig, sie alle kann niemand vollständig, können die allerwenigsten, von der Natur und dem Schicksal begünstigten, auch nur annähernd umfassen, und wem ein Gebet verschlossen ist, der kann in einem andern Ersatz finden. Wäre dem anders, so wären nicht blos unsere Frauen, sondern auch die Mehrzahl der Männer übel daran."

Again, *habemus confitentem reum*. Prof. Zeller evidently does not believe, with certain fetish-worshippers, that there is nothing in the world that moves which is not of Greek origin. In the *Pedagogical Seminary*,[1] for April, 1891, there is a brief but interesting article on "The New German School," by Dr. W. H. Burnham, which those intoxicated with the nectar of Zeus would do well to read. From it we learn something of the agitation which has made the phrase, "die neue deutsche Schule," familiar to every dweller in the Fatherland.

On the first of March, 1889, Deputy Von Schenckendorff presented "a petition signed by nearly 23,000 educators," to the Prussian Diet, and nearly contemporaneously two *Schulreformvereine* were founded at Berlin, at the head of which are Drs. Lange and Peters, Prof. Preyer and Dr. Hugo Göring; the organ of the union is *Die Neue Deutsche Schule*, and the members are in favour of "a new German school—a Lebensschule,—a place where pupils prepare for life by living." They object to the present system of higher education in Germany because it makes the students "un-German" and unfits them for the tasks and duties of life. In connection with this movement which lays especial stress upon the modern languages it is significant that Dr. Göring's book "Die Neue Deutsche Schule. Ein Weg zur Verwirklichung vaterländischer Erziehung (1890)," was dedicated, by permission,

[1] Pp. 13-18.

to Dr. Von Gossler, the Minister of Education, and that Güssfeldt's pamphlet is said to have been published with the approbation of the Emperor, to whom Dr. Göring thus confidently appeals: "Der Hohenzoller wird den Muth und die Kraft haben, das durchzusetzen was Noth thut; eine neue deutsche Schule." And that the confidence reposed in the young Emperor was not misplaced subsequent events have fully demonstrated, for in no department of his government has he shown himself more alive to the events of the hour and the requirements of his people than in that of education.

One of the first things the Kaiser Wilhelm II. did was to appoint a commission to enquire into the question of the reform of the Prussian secondary educational methods and institutions, which held its opening session on December 4, 1890, under the presidency of Dr. Von Gossler the Minister of Education. The young Emperor did more than this, he honoured the first meeting of the commission with his presence and delivered an address that should be encouraging to all friends of educational reform. A few extracts from this speech may be worth reproduction here:

"Only he who has been himself at the Gymnasium, and who has seen behind the scenes, knows where the weak spot is, *what is especially lacking is a national basis.* We must take German as the basis of instruction; we ought to bring up young Germans and not young Greeks and Romans. We must abandon the basis, which has existed for centuries, of the old monastic education of the middle ages, where Latin was prescribed together with a smattering of Greek." "Away with Latin composition! it embarrasses us, and with it we lose the time we ought to devote to German."[1]

In fact, the whole trend of the Emperor's remarks shows that he has emancipated himself from "the old monastic education of the middle ages," and those who place their hopes on the Hofmann manifesto have assuredly been reckoning without their Emperor. It is unnecessary here to cite any of the favourable comments made by the

[1] See Revue de l'Enseignement, Décembre, 1890, pp. 635-6.

newspapers and journals throughout the country upon this speech. Suffice it to say that it has made its influence felt far and wide. The commission closed its discussions in a little more than ten days, and on the 17th December the Emperor again addressed the members, and his speech on this occasion is as remarkable as that which he delivered when the sessions of the commission were opened. The pith of his address is contained in the following passage:—

"In summing up briefly, I would like, before closing, to pass to another principle of my house, which has been cited to-day by one of the eminent members of this commission. It is the motto: *Suum cuique!* It signifies: 'To each one that which suits him,' and not: 'to all the same thing.' It is this that we are doing to-day in this meeting; it is in accordance with this principle that you have to-day formulated your resolutions. Hitherto the road, if I can so speak, has led from Thermopylæ, passing by Cannæ, to Roszbach and to Vionville; as for me, I would lead the youth backwards from Sedan and Gravelotte, passing by Roszbach, to Mantinea and Thermopylæ. I believe that this is the true road, and that we must turn our youth in that direction."[1]

The sessions of the commission had been preceded by, and no doubt to some extent influenced by, the discussion which took place in a committee of the Prussian House of Deputies, appointed to enquire into the question of the admission of the graduates of the Realschulen to the learned professions upon the same footing as those of the Gymnasia.[2] The arguments of Dr. Schauenburg of Krefeld, Dr. Kropatschek, Dr. Bachem, Dr. Schmelzer, Dr. Arendt and Deputy von Schenckendorff, are particularly interesting. An extract from the speech of Dr. Bachem of Cologne, dealing with the pedagogical value of Greek and Latin, is worth reproduction:—

"The scientific value of instruction in Latin and Greek consists, on the one hand, in the formal discipline

---

[1] Revue de l'Enseignement, Janvier, 1891, p. 90, 91.

[2] See Pädagog. Archiv, 1890, S. 295-329. See also further, S. 641-692, where detailed reports of some of the speeches are given.

of the mind by means of the strict rules of these languages, and on the other, in the knowledge which they communicate of the view of the world held by the ancients. I believe that the formal discipline of the mind by means of the strict rule of higher mathematics, physics, chemistry, etc, is, at least, of equal value with that obtained by means of the Latin and Greek grammar, prosody, etc. As regards the acquisition of a view of the world, while I value very highly the ancients, I consider, especially in a Christian state, that the view of the world of a Shakespeare, a Milton, a Macaulay, a Walter Scott, is an infinitely more valuable ideal element of culture, than that of a Homer, or even a Sophocles. Moreover, vigour and beauty of form can be learned just as well from the English and French classics as from the Latin and Greek."

The result of the discussion was that the committee, by a majority of nine to six, decided to support the petition of Dr. Schauenburg of Krefeld, that the graduates of the Realschulen be admitted to the learned professions on the same basis as those of the Gymnasia. The house, about to adjourn for the Whitsuntide holidays, did not act upon the report of the committee, and the evidence which it had collected went before the royal commission appointed by the Emperor. This latter consisted of forty-three members, including professors of the various universities, teachers in the Gymnasia, dignitaries of the church, manufacturers, publicists, etc. A good majority of the commission had already declared themselves favourably disposed towards the classics and the *status quo*, so the full extent and importance of their conclusions is obvious. They discussed a large number of questions connected with secondary education,[1] but those of most interest to us are those relating directly to the subject of the ancient and modern languages. While the commission was assembling, the following important document was published over the signatures of no fewer than 149 ordinary professors, 112 extraordinary professors and 146 private-docents, belonging to the various German universities:—

[1] See Revue de l'Enseignement, Décembre, 1890, 629-638. Janvier, 1891, 78-91.

" The undersigned, while abstaining from any expression of opinion as to the manner in which instruction ought to be organized in the future in the classical gymnasia, are constrained to declare, as a result of their experience, that the preparatory instruction obtained by the graduates of the Gymnasia is little suited to serve as a basis for the study of the natural sciences and of medicine."

With regard to the classical languages the commission reported in favour of abolishing Latin composition, and Greek written translations in the Prima ; also in favour of the desirability of introducing English as an optional, and where possible, a compulsory subject, and of making drawing compulsory from the Quarta to the Obersecunda inclusive. More than this it declared in favour of making German the subject of greatest importance, and of extending as far as possible the time devoted to it, and of paying greater attention to the study of national history and of the foreign modern languages.

It also gave expression to the following opinion: " Considering the inevitable necessity for a new regulation of the privileges accorded to the secondary schools, the commission expresses the wish that an equal value should, as far as possible, be assigned to the education given by the Realschulen, and to that of the classic gymnasia."

These declarations, coming from a commission, twenty-seven of whose members are favourably disposed towards the present state of affairs, show how great the change in German opinion has been in the last ten years.

At the close of the labours of the commission the Emperor William issued a cabinet order requiring the members of the commission to advise him in the matter of the appointment of a small committee, whose task it should be to examine carefully the documents in the possession of the commission, and to make inspection of the educational institutions of Prussia. The committee of seven, which was soon after appointed, has made monthly reports, and the legislation, which is to be based upon its decisions, will, it is expected, go into effect in 1892. Meanwhile, in conformity with the votes of the

commission, which have been approved by the Emperor, the Minister of Education has issued a circular letter, dated 27th December, 1890, prescribing the suppression of Latin composition and Greek translation after the Prima, to date from the following Easter. This is confirmed by the circular letter of Feb. 12, 1891.

The comments of the German press upon the labours of the commission, which may be read in the *Central-Organ für die Interessen des Realschulwesens*, for February, 1891, are very significant. The *Kölnische Zeitung* takes a rather philosophical view of the situation, thinks that the Latinless schools will receive a great impulse, and the possibilities for future reform are good. (Nov. 12.)

The *Post* (Dec. 18), expresses the opinion that the Realschulen have demonstrated their value, and that sooner or later their graduates must be admitted to the study of medicine; the right still withheld from them will, ere long, be theirs.

The *Vossische Zeitung* (Dec. 14), protests against what it terms the "alleinseligmachende Methode des Unterrichts," for nature has implanted in men different qualities and different aspirations. To force them all to study the classical languages of old would be a source of infinite mischief. To cite a single sentence which covers the whole ground: "An dem Grundsatze der Gleichwertigkeit verschiedener Bildungswege ist durchaus festzuhalten, dieser Grundsatz vielmehr noch weiter durchzuführen."

The same journal, in its issue of December 16, speaks approvingly of the results of the investigations of the commission, and speaks of the great benefit that will be conferred upon all classes when the Realschulen and the Gymnasia are placed upon the same footing.

The *Hannoverscher Courier* (Dec. 14), says that the bold action of the Emperor in dealing with the question of secondary education, has met with general and hearty approval. It sees that it is possible to have Germany train patriotic citizens and useful members of society without forcing them to fill their heads with Greek prosody or Latin grammar. It also declares in favour of the placing of the Oberrealschulen and the Gymnasia on the same foot-

ing. In its issue of December 19 it refers approvingly to the decisions of the commission. Similarly the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *Deutsches Wochenblatt.*

From these comments and expressions of opinion the great importance of the action of the Emperor, and the conclusions arrived at by the committee and acted upon by the Minister of Education, can be judged. As a further indication of the mind of the Emperor, the following passage from the cabinet order of February 13, 1890, relating to the changes in the plan of education of the Cadet Corps, is significant:—

Das Deutsche wird *Mittelpunkt des gesamten Unterrichts.* Der Schüler ist in jedem Lehrgegenstande zum freien Gebrauche der Muttersprache anzuleiten. In den deutschen Lehrstunden selbst gleichwie im Literatur-Unterricht ist, bei Auswahl der Lesestücke, Vorträge und Auffsätze neben dem klassichen Altertum, seiner Sagen und Kulturwelt, *auch den germanischen Sagen, so wie den vaterländischen Stoffen und Schriftwerken ganz besondere Berücksichtigung zuzuwenden,* der Schüler aber auch mit dem geistigen Leben der anderen wichtigen Kulturvölker der Gegenwart durch Einführung in einzelne Meisterwerke ihrer Literatur bekannt zu machen. Im Unterricht der neueren Fremdsprachen ist von den ersten Stufen an die Anregung und Anleitung der Kadetten *zum praktischen Gebrauche der Sprachen* im Auge zu halten."

Truly the Kaiser Wilhelm does not agree with a certain distinguished Professor of comparative philology in his opinion, so naïvely expressed that "there is nothing in the world that moves which is not Greek in origin." The effect of the classical ambrosia is becoming weaker and weaker as the young Emperor continues to get better acquainted with his age and with his beloved Fatherland. Assuredly the time is not far distant when the prayer of one of Germany's greatest sons, the philosophic Herder, will be answered, and the generations to come will no longer cry aloud to be relieved of the useless task imposed upon them by the infatuated devotees of an antique civilization and the worshippers of a dead past.

NORWAY AND SWEDEN.

In the Scandinavian peninsula, and in Denmark, the same movement for reform has made itself felt. The history of higher education in these countries is exhaustively treated in the recent work of Dr. J. Paludan.[1] An interesting sketch is given of the movement for the reform of instruction in the high schools.[2] The increase in the attention devoted to German, French and English was long noticeable and the struggle between the classical and the modern languages soon came to a head. Step by step the dead languages kept losing ground, and we are not surprised to learn that in 1886, Louis de Geer, the chancellor of the Swedish universities "expressed an official opinion that the culture of to-day was slowly and irresistibly cutting loose from the language and literature of antiquity, and at the same time absorbing new and indispensable culture-elements, and that schools must gradually transform themselves in accordance with this course of development."[3]

The causes which have led up to this declaration may be read in the excellent work of Klinkhardt on the reform of higher education in Sweden. Still further reforms are in progress, tending towards the suppression of the classical languages, in order to make room for more valuable and more necessary subjects of study. What the general result has been so far is thus summed up by the editor of the "Pedagogical Seminary."[4]

"Sweden has profoundly reconstructed her educational system on a plan that might be called the most severely modern in the world, expelling not only Greek, but even

[1] Det Hoiere Skolevæsen i Danmark, Norge og Sverig. Kjobenhavn, 1885. See especially pages 544-557, 751-809.

[2] Op. cit. pp. 751-809.

[3] The Pedagogical Seminary (Worcester, Mass.) vol. I. (1891) p. 53.

[4] Das höhere Schulwesen Schwedens und dessen Reform im modernem Sinne, Leipzig, 1887.

Latin from intermediate schools and gymnasia and relegating both to the university, beside Hebrew and Sanscrit, and Denmark is taking steps in the same direction."[1]

During the debate which took place in the Norwegian Storting last year, there were made some speeches of great importance.[2]

Oberlehrer Horst, of Tromsö, declared that "the so-called classical culture" served no good end in life, and he "could not find words strong enough to express his opinion" of the "uselessness of the study of Greek."

Oberlehrer Koht, of Skien, declared that "what we need is educational institutions that stand in the service of the present, not in that of the past."

Oberpfarrer Wexelsen was willing to banish both Greek and Latin from the schools. Their pedagogical value could easily be replaced by other branches of instruction. The idea of their being a necessary part of higher education had been dissipated.

Ullmann, of Bratsberg, spoke in favour of abolishing the study of Greek altogether, and of making Latin optional in the highest classes. He also expressed the opinion that there is no difficulty in replacing the classical languages with subjects of equal value and more utility. The classical enthusiasts in his opinion now found themselves in the last ditch. History and experience were both against them, and the spirit of modern life had sounded their death-knell as compulsory, and might even extinguish them as optional subjects.

But most important of all were the opinions expressed by Jacob Sverdrup, Minister of Education, who spoke as follows:—

"In the future the way to a general higher education, would, for the great majority, lie in the modern elements of culture. There was no sense in merely abolishing Greek. Why should the axe be laid at the root of the Greek tree, and not at that of the Latin? To have a uniform school with a pretty marked predilection for Latin,

[1] Vol I., p. 10.

[2] See Report in "Pædagogium," September, 1890, S. 784-789.

would be a reactionary step. The general basis of higher education ought to be the mother tongue and history. This would all come in good time and the classics can be gradually abolished." Evidently in the home of Gustav-Adolf, they do not believe that "there is nothing in the world that moves which is not Greek in origin."

These essays, in which an endeavour is made to indicate the present state of the world's thought on the question of the comparative merits of the ancient and the modern languages, are penned in no spirit of opposition to Greek. Greek, properly taught, has its place in our educational institutions, and the grand extent of its life, from pre-Homeric bards to the singers and prose writers of our own day, bids it hope for the future a more glorious career in pedagogy than has been its fortune to pursue in the past.

It is not too much to anticipate that, in the near future, Greek will be taught as a *modern* language, and Latin as a portion of a university course in modern languages. Then will the strife of long years cease, and gentle peace assert her reign. May the classicists, *oblatæ occasionis properi*, hasten the happy result.

Educ 2248.91.10
Modern languages and classics in Am
Widener Library 004356525
3 2044 079 733 341